



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,893	09/15/2003	Faramak Vakil	APP 1479	1293
9941	7590	06/16/2006	EXAMINER	
TELCORDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			COFFY, EMMANUEL	
ONE TELCORDIA DRIVE 5G116			ART UNIT	
PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-4157			PAPER NUMBER	
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/662,893	Applicant(s) VAKIL ET AL.	
	Examiner Emmanuel Coffy	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the remarks filed on April 7, 2006. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 2 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-17 are directed to a method & system for "Plug and Play Installation of Network Entities In a Mobile Wireless Internet."

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. On page 7 of the remarks, Applicant asserts that O'Toole actually discloses the use of configuration table having a package of configuration records for a specific device but does not disclose the step of identifying the software necessary for the entity to provide the service. The Examiner agrees and this issue is addressed in this action below. Applicant proceeded to distinguish the invention stating that: "there is also no teaching or suggestion in O'Toole of the step of "collecting the necessary software from one or more software inventories in communication with the plug server." (See remarks page 8). However, on page 9 Applicant admits that Yao et al. describes classic plug and play functionality whereby a device is connected to a computer and drivers are installed to enable its use. Thus, this last recitation of the invention reads on Yao and since Yao is an art of record, it applies equally to the invention at bar.

On page 8 of the remarks, Applicant states "claims 4-6 were not specifically addressed by the Examiner. Applicant is directed to page 4 of the last Office Action where claims 4-6 are addressed directly following claim 2.

On page 9 of the remarks, Applicant requests further clarification as to the application of Wenzel to claim 7. Applicant is directed to col. 9, line 65-col. 10, line 16 of O'Toole for further clarification. Additionally, the new action will shed light on this issue.

Applicant then asserted the following: "with respect to claims 15 and 16, applicant disagrees with the contention of the Examiner that O'Toole teaches a plug server having an

inspector agent software module for inspection..." The Examiner agrees because claim, which was a broad claim, was amended to narrow its scope. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant further requests clarification as to claims 14 and 17, this action addresses this issue.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al. (US 6,757,723) in view of Yao et al. (US 6,813,670).

O'Toole substantially teaches the invention as claimed including a network appliance which is capable of remote booting and obtaining its configuration information from a source located far away. (See abstract)

Claim 1.

O'Toole teaches a method for connecting an entity to a network that provides mobile wireless Internet service to a user of the network comprising: (See fig. 1 and 2)

assigning a temporary IP address to the entity; (See col. 9, lines 65-67.)

creating a communication link between the entity and a plug server through the Internet; (See col. 12, lines 25-34.)

forwarding the necessary software from the plug server to the entity; and,

installing and configuring the necessary software at the entity. (See col. 12, line 53-col. 13, line 9). O'Toole does not specifically teach: "identifying the software necessary for the entity to provide the service; (See col. 12, line 53-col. 13, line 9)

collecting the necessary software from one or more software inventories in communication with the plug server; (See col. 13, lines 1-16.). However, Yao does throughout, but for more specific teachings See abstract and col. 3, line 18-col. 4, line 36).

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the plug and play server disclosed by Yao because it would be advantageous to be able to perform automatic software installation when a new device is connected to a computer relieving a user of the oftentimes laborious and confusing installation process.

Claim 4.

O'Toole teaches the method of claim 1 as discussed above further comprising the steps of: securing the communication link between the entity and the plug server using a request for secure HTTP. (See col. 13, lines 64-67 and col. 14, lines 38-47.)

Claim 5.

O'Toole teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: assigning a new IP address to the entity using DRCP and/or DHCP. (See col. 14, lines 13-15)

Claim 7.

O'Toole substantially teaches the method of claim 1 as discussed above wherein the step of assigning a temporary IP address to the entity further comprises the steps of:

sending a router solicitation message; (See col. 10, lines 9-14)

receiving a router authentication message and obtaining a network prefix therefrom;  
(See col. 10, lines 9-16)

constructing a temporary IP address for the entity; and, (See col. 9, lines 65-67.)  
performing duplicate address detection. (See col. 10, lines 1-7). (by testing the address to make certain that it is not in use).

5. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al. (US 6,757,723) in view of Yao et al. (US 6,813,670) in further view of Cho (US 2003/0016682).

Claim 2.

O'Toole teaches the method of claim 1 as discussed above wherein the step of identifying the software necessary for the entity to provide the service further comprises the step of sending a software inspector agent from the plug server to the entity capable of discovering the software needs of the entity. (See col. 15, lines 12-22 and col. 16, lines 61-63.)

Neither O'Toole nor Yao disclose a "software agent". However, Cho does throughout, but for more specific teachings see abstract and paragraph 0042.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole and the plug and play server disclosed by Yao with the gateway of Cho because it would be advantageous to be able to perform automatic software installation when a new device is connected to a computer relieving a user of the oftentimes laborious and confusing installation process.

Claim 6.

O'Toole teaches the method of claim 2 further comprising the steps of: sending a request from the inspector agent to the plug server requesting necessary link layer and topology data; collecting the necessary link layer and topology data from a cell parameter server; and, forwarding the necessary link layer and topology data to the entity. (See col. 15, lines 11-22 and col. 16, lines 61-65.)

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al. (US 6,757,723) in view of Yao et al. (US 6,813,670) in further view of Wenzel (US 6,925,297).

Claim 3.

O'Toole substantially teaches the method of claim 1 as discussed above further comprising the steps of: collecting information about the identification of the user; (See col. 12, lines 34-36.)

Neither O'Toole nor Yao disclose performing authentication of the user's identification prior to the step of identifying the software necessary for the entity to provide the service. However, Wenzel does. See col. 3, lines 1-67.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration systems articulated by O'Toole and Yao with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more complicated and less reliable.

7. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al. (US 6,757,723) in view of Wenzel (US 6,925,297) in further view of Cho (US 2003/0016682).

Claim 15.

O'Toole substantially teaches a plug server capable of communicating with the Internet and an entity capable of providing Internet services to a user comprising:  
an inspector agent software module for identifying the software necessary for the entity to provide the service to the user and for installing the necessary software in the entity. See col. 16, lines 61-67. O'Toole does not teach:

a login handler software module for authenticating identification information from the user;



a subscription handler software for validating subscription information from the user;  
a selection handler software module for routing the request of the user to either the login handles or subscription handler; and,

However, Wenzel does. See col. 5, lines 46-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more complicated and less reliable.

Neither O'Toole nor Wenzel specifically disclose a "software agent". However, Cho does throughout, but for more specific teachings see abstract and paragraph 0042.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole and the AAA server disclosed by Wenzel with the gateway of Cho because it would be advantageous to be able to perform automatic software installation when a new device is connected to a computer relieving a user of the oftentimes laborious and confusing installation process.

Claim 16.

O'Toole substantially teaches the plug server of claim 15 as discussed above. O'Toole does not teach "wherein the login handler communicates with an authentication, authorization and accounting (AAA) protocol based server." However, Wenzel does. See col. 5, lines 46-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more complicated and less reliable.



Claim 17.

O'Toole substantially teaches the plug server of claim 15 as discussed above. O'Toole does not specifically disclose "wherein the subscription handler communicates with a credit bureau server". However, Wenzel does. See col. 5, lines 7-12. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more complicated and less reliable.

8. Claims 8 -14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole et al. (US 6,757,723) in view of Yao et al. (US 6,813,670) in further view of Wenzel (US 6,925,297).

Claim 8.

O'Toole substantially teaches a system for connecting an entity to a network that provides a mobile wireless Internet service to a user of the network comprising:  
wherein the plug server sends an inspector agent to the entity to identify the software needed by the entity to provide the service to the user, collecting the identified necessary information from the software inventory, collecting the necessary link layer and topology data from the cell parameter server and forwarding the collected software and data to the entity. See col. 16, lines 61-67. O'Toole does not teach

a plug server in communication with the entity to be connected;

a software inventory in communication with the plug server for storing software necessary for the entity to provide the service to the user;

a cell parameter server in communication with the plug server for storing link layer and topology data necessary for the entity to provide the service to the user; However, Yao does. See col. 3,

lines 18-24; col. 4 lines 8-14 and lines 22-28.

Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the automatic server-side plug-and-play disclosed by Yao because when devices are disconnected from the computer, the device drivers are frequently not automatically uninstalled which can cause errors since the programs running on the computer have access to the devices as if they were still connected to the computer.

Claim 9.

O'Toole substantially teaches the system of claim 8 as discussed above further comprising a means for communicating between the plug server and the entity in a secure manner. (See '723, col. 13, lines 64-67; col. 14, lines 38-46.)

Claim 10.

O'Toole substantially teaches the system of claim 8 as discussed above wherein the entity further comprises a server discovery software module for discovering a plug server in the Internet. See '723, col. 8, line 64-col. 9, line 18.

Claim 11.

O'Toole substantially teaches the system of claim 8 as discussed above wherein the entity further comprises an Auto-IP software module for assigning a temporary IP address to the entity. See '723, col. 9, lines 65-67.

Claim 12.

O'Toole substantially teaches the system of claim 8 as discussed above. O'Toole does not disclose "further comprising an AAA protocol based authentication server in communication with the plug server in order to authenticate information about the identity of the user of the entity."

However, Wenzel does. See col. 4, lines 50-59 and col. 5, lines 14-27. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more complicated and less reliable.

Claim 13.

O'Toole substantially teaches the system of claim 12 as discussed above. O'Toole does not disclose "further comprising a profile server in communication with the authentication server and the plug server for storing information regarding the identity of entities in the mobile wireless Internet."

However, Wenzel does. See col. 5, lines 46-65. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more complicated and less reliable.

Claim 14.

O'Toole substantially teaches the method of claim 8 as discussed above. O'Toole does not specifically disclose "further comprising a credit bureau server in communication with the plug server in order to validate information about the subscription of the user of the entity". However, Wenzel does. See col. 5, lines 7-12. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote configuration system articulated by O'Toole with the authentication disclosed by Wenzel because the inability to authenticate a mobile terminal facilitates fraudulent activity and billing becomes more

complicated and less reliable.

### **CONCLUSION**

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Coffy whose telephone number is (571) 272-3997. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2157

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Emmanuel Coffy  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2157

\*\*\*

EC  
June 3, 2006

\*\*\*

  
ARIELLE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100